AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 Attorney Docket No.: Q94207

Application No.: 10/574,472

REMARKS

The specification has been amended to resolve an issue raised by the Examiner. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the recitations of claim 2, and claims 2, 7, and 8 have been

canceled accordingly. Claim 1 has also been amended so that the melting point is within the

range of 200-240°C, based on paragraph [0034] of the originally filed specification.

Entry of the above amendment is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Specification

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the disclosure because of

the original specification provides an explicit definition for "essentially consisting of" (paragraph

0010) that is directly contradictory to the established definition for "consisting essentially of"

(MPEP § 2111.3). In this regard, the Examiner assumes that the doubly negative statement at the

end of the paragraph was a typographical error and the phrase is being interpreted by its

established meaning as outlined in the MPEP.

In response, Applicants have amended the specification as suggested by the Examiner.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the objection has been overcome, and withdrawal of the

objection is respectfully requested.

Anticipation Rejection

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as

being anticipated by Calundann (US Pat. 4,219,461).

In response, and to expedite allowance, Applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate

the recitations of claim 2, which was not included in this rejection.

6

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 Attorney Docket No.: Q94207

Application No.: 10/574,472

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the anticipation rejection has been overcome, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejection

On page 2 of the Office Action, the present invention is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calundann (US Pat. 4,219,461).

In response, Applicants submit that Calundann teaches that his crystalline polymer exhibits anisotropic melt phase at a temperature below approximately 320°C, preferably below approximately 300°C, for example, at approximately 270-280°C (see col. 3, lines 25-31). It also teaches that liquid-crystalline polyesters commonly exhibit a melting point of at least 250°C and preferably of at least 260°C as determined by DSC (see col. 3, lines 37-40). Although the temperature at which the polymer exhibits atypical anisotropic melt phase is not the same as the melting point of the polymer, Claundann suggests that the different scanning calorimeter melting temperature of the polyester is in the range of 270-280°C (see Claim 32). The polyester obtained in the working example exhibited a melt endotherm at about 273°C (column 11, lines 44-48). Calundann does not even suggest to provide liquid-crystalline polyester whose melting point determined by DSC is below 250°C.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the amended claims, which recite a low melting point, are not obvious over the prior art, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Provisional Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejections

On page 5 of the Office Action, claims 1-4, 7, and 8 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 7 of

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 Attorney Docket No.: Q94207

Application No.: 10/574,472

copending Application No. 11/588,293. Also, on page 5 of the Office Action, claims 5 and 6 are

provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being

unpatentable over claim 7 of copending Application No. 11/588,293 as applied to claim 1 above,

and further in view of Calundann (US Pat. 4,219,461).

Since these rejections are provisional, Applicants defer responding until a future point in

time.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Registration No. 33,725

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

23373 CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 4, 2008

8